arXiv:1301.5345v2 [quant-ph] 5 Feb 2013

Physical principles for a statistical model of quantization

Agung Budiyono*
Jalan Emas 772 Growong Lor RT 04 RW 02 Juwana,
Pati, 59185 Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

(Dated: February 7, 2013)

Abstract

We have previously proposed a statistical model of quantization based on a stochastic deviation from infinitesimal stationary action following an exponential law. In the present work we shall show that the model can be derived uniquely from three physical principles: (1) Microscopic indeterminism; (2) Lagrangian scheme; and (3) No correlation without interaction or separability. The first two lead to a class of statistical models with generic 'non-local correlations' and the third principle uniquely selects the exponential law.

PACS numbers: 05.20.Gg; 03.65.Ta; 03.65.Ud

Keywords: Physical principles; Statistical model of quantization; Microscopic indeterminism; Lagrangian scheme; Compound system; No correlation without interaction; Separability; Random deviation from infinitesimal stationary action; Quantum-classical correspondence; Possible modification of quantum mechanics

---

*Electronic address: agungbymlati@gmail.com

I. MOTIVATION

The formalism of standard quantum theory is developed based on 'abstract mathematical axioms' with obscure physical meaning. Despite the superb empirical successes of the 'quantum rules' to calculate with very high accuracy the probability to find various random results in measurement over identically prepared ensemble of system, there are still violent disagreements among quantum physicist with regard to the conceptual foundation of the theory [1]. Such diverse views disclose the fact that we still do not have a consensus on what are the physical principles that underlie quantum theory. "*How come the quantum*?" [2]. What is the physical origin of the Schödinger equation and uncertainty relation? Can we derive its exquisite mathematical framework uniquely from a set of physical principles? This situation is in a stark contrast with the special theory of relativity which is founded based on intuitive physical principles: principle of relativity and invariance of velocity of light, or classical mechanics in general which can be developed based on the principle of stationary action. Another motivation of having such principles is that they might give us physical insights on how one should look for possible modification of the theory by modifying the principles or varying the parameters whose values are not determined by the principles (free parameters).

With the above motivation, there have been continuous attempts to derive the Schrödinger equation using various physical models within realist theoretical framework [3–21]. In this approach, one generally assumes that the Schrödinger equation is not a fundamental equation of Nature, but is emergent from a deeper physical theory. The hope is that the Schrödinger equation thus derived will speak for itself necessitating no further physical interpretation. A different kind of approach to investigate the problem of "why the quantum" is pursued by a rapidly growing community based on the hypothesis that all physics are emergent from information [22–43], following Wheeler's program "it from bit" in which he argued that "all things physical are information-theoretic in origin" [2]. In this line of approach one reverses the logical flow of quantum information [44], that is to search for a set of basic features of information processing which can be promoted as physical principles to uniquely reconstruct the mathematical formalism of quantum mechanics. Such an approach is inevitably operational or instrumental in nature where elementary laboratory procedures like preparation and measurement play fundamental role.

With the same motivation to understand the physical meaning behind the 'formal-mathematical rules' of canonical quantization, we have proposed in the previous work a statistical model of quantization for non-relativistic systems of spin-less point-like particles by modifying the classical dynamics of ensemble [45]. This is done by assuming an *exponential distribution of stochastic deviation from infinitesimal stationary action* within the traditional theory of probability. See also Refs. [46–50] for related works. The prediction of canonical quantization (with a unique ordering of operators) is then shown to be reproduced as a specific case of the model when the average deviation from infinitesimal stationary action is given by $\hbar/2$.

It is then instructive to ask: *why the statistical model*? One may for example demand a physical explanation: *why exponential among the infinitude of probability distributions*? In the present paper we shall show that the model can be uniquely derived, up to some free parameters, from three physical principles: microscopic indeterminism, Lagrangian scheme, and no-correlation without interaction or separability, whose meaning and motivation to be discussed in the next section. Unlike informational principles which are instrumentalist, these principles follow the realist tradition of classical physics where measurement does not play any fundamental role.

II. THREE PHYSICAL PRINCIPLES

Since Newton we know that classical mechanics provides a very accurate description of the dynamics of macroscopic bodies. However, during the last century, we have also gathered a lot of evidences through observation that it has to be corrected in microscopic world. It is an empirical fact that in experiment with microscopic objects, identically prepared copies of system will in general give a set of random results if subjected to measurement. One may thus assume that in 'microscopic time scale' the dynamics of the system is indeterministic. However unlike the Brownian motion, we do not know the physical origin of the stochastic behavior of the system. Moreover, due to the empirical validity of the classical mechanics in macroscopic regime which is governed by deterministic law, the microscopic indeterminism must be superimposed on the deterministic classical mechanics and must be negligible in macroscopic world. It is then safe to put the following assumption:

- Principle (1) *Microscopic indeterminism*: There is a finite microscopic time scale where the stationary action principle of classical mechanics is not accurate, the deviation from which is inherently indeterministic and negligible in macroscopic regime.

Next, the experimental verifications of the predictions of quantum theory suggest that microscopic world is sensitive to 'potentials' rather than 'forces' [51]. This is for example seen in the theoretical description and observation of AB (Aharonov-Bohm) effect [52–54]. Essentially similar effects which reveal the sensitivity of microscopic phenomena to potentials are also observed in particle interference experiment involving electrostatic [55] and gravitational potentials [56]. This encourages us to assume that Lagrangian scheme based on potentials is more fundamental than Newtonian scheme based on forces [57]. One then has the following second principle:

- Principle (2) *Lagrangian scheme*: In general, Lagrangian scheme based on potentials is not physically equal to but more fundamental than Newtonian scheme based on forces.

The manifestation of the above principle in quantum theory can be seen in the Schrödinger equation or Feynman path integral where potential and Lagrangian, respectively contribute directly to the time development of the system. Combined with the first principle, principle (2) suggests that the indeterministic correction to classical mechanics can not be adequately described by introducing random forces as in Brownian motion, but should be added as a random fluctuation with respect to the Lagrangian in a microscopic time scale.

Finally, to motivate the third principle, let us consider a compound system. For illustration, it is sufficient to consider two particles system. Let us assume that the particles are not interacting with each other at a given time of interest. Then it is reasonable to assume that there is a situation where the statistics of the microscopic corrections to the classical dynamics of the two particles are also independent from each other. This must in particular be the case when the particles were not interacting in the past so that it is physically absurd to assume that the statistical behavior of the two particles are correlated to each other. It is thus natural to draw the following principle:

- Principle (3) *No correlation without interaction*: Subsystems with non-intersecting past light cones behave independently from each other.

The above principle implies a notion of statistical separability between subsystems whose past light cones do not intersect so that we shall also later refer to it as the principle of *separability*.

The above set of principles replaces the principle of stationary action of classical mechanics. The first two suggest that one should modify the principle of stationary action in microscopic time scale by introducing an inherent stochastic element which can not be represented by random forces and is negligible in some macroscopic limit. It will be clear later in the next section that the first two principles will in general lead to a class of statistical models which allow one to generate correlation without interaction. The third principle then uniquely single out a statistical model which precludes such an absurd physical situation.

III. EXPONENTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF DEVIATION FROM INFINITESIMAL STATIONARY ACTION

Let us show that the above three principles are sufficient to reconstruct uniquely, up to some free parameters, the statistical model of quantization reported in Ref. [45]. From the first principle, one has to have a physical quantity to measure the deviation from classical mechanics and this quantity has to be stochastic in microscopic time scale. Moreover, by the second principle, the stochastic deviation has to be measured with respect to Lagrangian rather than classical forces. Hence, one must first have a formulation of classical mechanics which exploits Lagrangian in microscopic time scale. It is clear that such a formulation must use action along a very short trajectory during microscopic time interval rather than the Lagrangian itself.

Such a formulation can be developed from the Hamilton-Jacobi theory as follows. First, in Hamilton-Jacobi theory one has [57]

$$-\underline{H}(q,\underline{p})=\partial_t\underline{S}\ \ \&\ \ \underline{p}=\partial_q\underline{S}, \tag{1}$$

where q denotes the configuration of the system, t is time, $\underline{H}$ and $\underline{p}$ are the classical Hamiltonian and momentum, respectively, and $\underline{S}$ is the Hamilton's principle function. Inserting the right equation to the left hand side of the left equation gives the familiar Hamilton-Jacobi equation, $\partial_t\underline{S}+\underline{H}(q,\partial_q\underline{S})=0$. The pair of equations in (1) are equivalent to

$$d\underline{S}=-\underline{H}dt+\underline{p}\cdot dq=Ldt, \tag{2}$$

where $L(q,\dot{q}) \doteq \underline{p}(\dot{q})\cdot\dot{q} - \underline{H}(q,\underline{p}(\dot{q}))$ with $\dot{q} \doteq dq/dt$ is the Lagrangian, so that $d\underline{S}$ is the infinitesimal stationary action along the corresponding short classical path during the infinitesimal time interval dt. Below we shall identify the infinitesimal time interval dt so that Eq. (2) is valid as the 'microscopic time scale' assumed in principle (1).

Given the Lagrangian, the first two principles then tell us that the element of randomness has to appear as a deviation from $d\underline{S} = Ldt$ which must be ignorable in macroscopic regime. To do this, let us introduce a real-valued stochastic function $S(q,\xi;t)$ of the configuration of the system, time, and a random variable ξ, so that in some well-defined classical limit to be discussed later, its differential is approximately given by $d\underline{S}$: $dS \to d\underline{S}$. ξ may in turn be a function of a set of random variables. $dS - d\underline{S}$ is thus randomly fluctuating, measuring the stochastic correction to classical mechanics, and it is its statistics that is assumed by the first two principles as the basic ingredient of the statistical model. Let $P(dS|d\underline{S})$ denotes the conditional probability density that the differential of S is given by dS when the differential of $\underline{S}$ is $d\underline{S}$. The first two principles thus instruct us to find $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ so that in the limiting physical domain corresponding to macroscopic world it reduces to

$$P_S(dS|d\underline{S}) \longrightarrow \delta(dS - d\underline{S}) = \delta\big(dS - (\underline{p}\cdot dq - \underline{H}dt)\big). \tag{3}$$

Let us then clarify what we mean by classical limit. Intuitively, the classicality should be attained if the indeterministic correction introduced by the fluctuations of dS around $d\underline{S}$ is negligible as compared to what is being corrected, that is $d\underline{S}$. To make this statement definite, let us assume that the stochastic deviation from the infinitesimal stationary action has a finite average denoted by $\langle|dS - d\underline{S}|\rangle$. Then one can define the classical limit as the regime when $\langle|dS - d\underline{S}|\rangle$ is much smaller than $|d\underline{S}|$, namely when $\langle|dS - d\underline{S}|\rangle \ll |d\underline{S}|$. With this mathematical identification of classicality, there are infinitely many functional forms of $P(dS|d\underline{S})$ which reduce to Eq. (3) in the classical limit. We therefore have to select one which is most natural and most importantly which does not lead to absurd physical situation warned by principle (3).

Let us emphasize before proceeding that like Hamilton's principle function $\underline{S}$, S is a function of the configuration of the system $q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots\}$. Further, due to its dependence on ξ, S is in general a multi-valued function of q. Namely, fixing t, its value is not uniquely determined by q. One can also see that S and $S + S_0(\xi)$, where S_0 depends only on ξ, generate exactly the same statistical distribution $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$. Hence, given $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$, the functional form of S is not unique up to some function of ξ. Next, notice that there is no a priori reason which tells us how the sign of $dS - d\underline{S}$ is distributed. In such a situation, the principle of insufficient reason (principle of indifferent) [58] then suggests to assume that there is equal probability for $dS - d\underline{S}$ to take positive or negative values. $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ must therefore depend only on $|dS - d\underline{S}|$. Moreover, with the same argumentation, it is also reasonable to assume that the statistics of the deviation is homogeneous in configuration space and stationary in time. Of course $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ may also depend on some free parameters. As will be shown below, such a free parameter is needed to connect smoothly the statistical model to classical mechanics as a limiting case via Eq. (3). It will also be shown that the prediction of canonical quantization corresponds to a specific value of this free parameter.

Now let us proceed to exercise principle (3) to avoid absurd physical situation that one can generate correlation without interaction. To do this, let us consider two particles system whose configuration are denoted by q_1 and q_2, respectively. Let us assume that the two particles are not interacting at some given time. Then, the classical Lagrangian is decomposable as $L(q_1, q_2, \dot{q}_1, \dot{q}_2) = L_1(q_1, \dot{q}_1) + L_2(q_2, \dot{q}_2)$, so that the infinitesimal stationary action is also decomposable as $d\underline{S}(q_1, q_2) = d\underline{S}_1(q_1) + d\underline{S}_2(q_2)$. Let us further assume that the particles were not interacting in the past. In this case, principle (3) then tells us that the dynamics and statistics of the two particles are independent from each other. The dynamical independence demands that dS must also be decomposable as

$$dS(q_1, q_2) = dS_1(q_1) + dS_2(q_2). \tag{4}$$

This naturally implies statistical independence of the two particles so that $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ must be separable into that of each single particle, otherwise one can create correlation without interaction. One therefore has the following functional equation:

$$P_S(dS_1 + dS_2|d\underline{S}_1 + d\underline{S}_2) = P_S(dS_1|d\underline{S}_1)P_S(dS_2|d\underline{S}_2). \tag{5}$$

Following the argumentation of Ref. [45], one can indeed show that assuming Eq. (5), the probability density of $q = (q_1, q_2)$ is separable for all time if it is initially separable.

Equation (5) is satisfied by the following exponential function:

$$P_S(dS|d\underline{S}) \propto N e^{-\frac{2}{\lambda}(dS - d\underline{S})}, \tag{6}$$

where N is a normalization factor and λ is a non-vanishing free parameter with action dimensional. Namely, the distribution of $|dS - d\underline{S}|$ is given by an exponential law with mean value $|\lambda/2|$. As shown in Ref. [45], to have a smooth correspondence with classical mechanics of ensemble when $S \rightarrow \underline{S}$, it is sufficient (while not necessary) to choose N to be proportional to a quantity determined uniquely by the classical Hamiltonian as

$$N \propto \exp(-\theta(S)dt) \ \text{ with } \ \theta(S) = \partial_q \cdot \Big(\frac{\partial \underline{H}}{\partial \underline{p}}\Big|_{\underline{p}=\partial_q S}\Big). \tag{7}$$

Since $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ must depend only on $|dS - d\underline{S}|$, then $(dS - d\underline{S})/\lambda$ must be positive definite. Moreover, since the sign of $dS - d\underline{S}$ is assumed to change equally probably, then the sign of λ must also be fluctuating randomly with equal probability:

$$P_\lambda(\lambda) = P_\lambda(-\lambda). \tag{8}$$

One can see in Ref. [45] that this assumption plays important role in the derivation of the Schrödinger equation or the quantization of classical Hamiltonian. Moreover, since λ is the only random variable that appears in the equation, then one may conclude that ξ depends on λ so that one has $S = S(q, \lambda; t)$ [45]. It is also evident that in the regime where the average deviation from the infinitesimal stationary action $|\lambda/2|$ is much smaller than the infinitesimal stationary action itself $|d\underline{S}|$, namely $|d\underline{S}/\lambda| \gg 1$, Eq. (6) reduces to Eq. (3), as expected. This suggests that $|\lambda|$ must have a microscopic value. Indeed we have shown in Ref. [45] that the results of canonical quantization is reproduced when $\lambda = \pm\hbar$ with equal probability.

IV. GENERIC INSEPARABILITY

Let us consider the general case when dS is not decomposable

$$dS(q_1, q_2) \neq dS_1(q_1) + dS_2(q_2). \tag{9}$$

Then, $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ of Eq. (6) of the two particles is not separable into that of each single particle even when $d\underline{S}$ is decomposable, or even when the two particles are not interacting at the time of interest. This means that the distribution of the deviation from the infinitesimal stationary action of the two particles can not be separated into the deviation from the infinitesimal stationary action of each single particle. From the principle (3), this may for example be the case when the two particles were interacting in the past. When $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ is inseparable, the deviation from the infinitesimal stationary action of the two particles are thus ‘some how’ correlated. One can not even define joint-probability density for the deviation with respect to the two particles. The two particles system should be regarded as a single indivisible whole.

Moreover, notice that the distribution of the deviation of Eq. (6) does not refer to the location of the two particles. In particular, it is independent of the distance of the two particles. Hence, if dS is not decomposable (even when $d\underline{S}$ is decomposable), the statistical inseparability of the random deviation with respect to the two particles persist even if the two particles are space-like separated. We therefore argue that this is the statistical origin of the ‘quantum mechanical non-local correlation’ [59–63]. One can however see that the ‘nonlocal correlation’ is ignorable in the classical limit when Eq. (3) is effectively valid since in this regime dS is approximately equal to $d\underline{S}$ which is decomposable for non-interacting particles. The above analysis can be extended easily to general compound systems.

To further justify the above interpretation, one can show by following the derivation of the Schrödinger equation reported in Ref. [45] based on Eq. (6), that if $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$ is separable as in Eq. (5), then the corresponding wave function is also separable if initially it is separable

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(q_1,q_2,|\lambda|) &= \Psi_1(q_1,|\lambda|)\Psi_2(q_2,|\lambda|),\\ \Psi_j(q_j,|\lambda|) &\doteq \sqrt{\Omega_j(q_j,|\lambda|)}e^{\frac{i}{|\lambda|}S_j(q_j,|\lambda|)},\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

$j = 1,2$, where $\Omega_j(q_j,|\lambda|)$ is the joint-probability density of q_j and $|\lambda|$ [45]. This means that the class of inseparable wave functions or entangled quantum mechanical (pure) states corresponds to inseparable $P_S(dS|d\underline{S})$.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

According to the first principle, quantum fluctuations is thus a stochastic fluctuation in microscopic time scale superimposed on deterministic classical dynamics and ignorable in the macroscopic regime. The second principle then implies that in compound system, the statistics of the microscopic fluctuation in general can not be separated into those with respect to the subsystems regardless of the distance of the subsystems. Hence, the first two principles inevitably lead to a class of statistical models with generic ‘nonlocal correlations’ among the subsystems. The third principle, which imposes a physically intuitive restriction that no-correlation can be generated without interaction or the separability of subsystems with non-intersecting past light cones, then chooses uniquely the exponential distribution of deviation from infinitesimal stationary action among all the possible statistical models, up to some free parameters that characterize the statistical distribution of λ. In this respect, quantization can be regarded as the most natural way to introduce stochastic correction to classical mechanics in microscopic time scale.

It is remarkable that the separability principle (3) or the principle of no-correlation without interaction is the key to the unique statistical model of quantization. It is often mentioned, following Schrödinger, that "inseparability is the characteristic trait of quantum mechanics, the one that enforces its entire departure from classical lines of thought" [64]. Our reconstruction however suggests that statistical models with inseparable statistics are generic due to principles (1) and (2). What distinguishes quantum theory from these statistical models is the demand of principle (3) of the statistical separability between subsystems whose past light cones do not intersect. Further, since Eq. (6) leads to the derivation of the Schrödinger equation [45] and uncertainty relation [49], one may conclude that the separability principle is the physical principle that is responsible for the two most important features of the statistical model of quantization: the linearity of the Schrödinger equation and the canonical commutation relation. It is interesting to further note that to develop the two features, one needs to consider a compound system which makes possible the exercise of principle (3).

Let us notice that violating the principle of separability leads to the violation of causality: one can create correlation without interaction. It is thus a direct implication of the principle of causality which lies at the very foundation of modern physics. By contrast, the first two principles are empirical based on our experiences. There is therefore a possibility that these principles might have limited domain of applicability and be eventually violated: the history of theoretical physics tells us that anything based on experience will eventually be overthrown. For example, one might assume that in much shorter time scale, the first principle of microscopic indeterminism is no more valid to be replaced by some not yet known form of determinism.

Keeping the three principles, there is still room for possible modification due to the presence of the free parameter λ in Eq. (6) which determines the average deviation from the infinitesimal stationary action given by $|\lambda/2|$. As shown in Ref. [45], canonical quantization corresponds to the case when $\lambda = \pm\hbar$ so that the average deviation is given by $\hbar/2$. This naturally raises a question whether there are physical situations where the average deviation is not equal to $\hbar/2$. One for example can ask whether the value of $\hbar$ varies with the evolution of the universe [65]. One may also ask whether $|\lambda|$ fluctuates randomly in the vicinity of the currently held value of $\hbar$ with non-vanishing yet very small width as suggested in Ref. [48]. These cases are in principle falsifiable giving precision test to quantum mechanics against the statistical model of quantization. It is of course desirable to have a stronger set of principles that will lead to the determination of the value of $\hbar$ or the distribution of $|\lambda|$.

Acknowledgments

---

[1] C. J. Isham, Lectures on Quantum Theory: Mathematical and Structural Foundation, Imperial College Press, London, 1995.

[2] J. A. Wheeler, in W. H. Zurek, Editor, Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information, Westview Press, 1990.

[3] I. Fényes, Z. Phys. 132 (1952) 81.

[4] W. Weizel, Z. Phys. 134 (1953) 264; 135 (1953) 270; 136 (1954) 582.

[5] D. Kershaw, Phys. Rev. B 136 (1964) 1850.

[6] E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. 150 (1966) 1079; Quantum Fluctuations, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985.

[7] L. de la Peña-Auerbach, J. Math. Phys. 10 (1969) 1620

[8] L. de la Peña-Auerbach and A. M. Cetto, Found. Phys. 12 (1982) 1017.

[9] E. Santamato, Phys. Rev. D 29 (1984) 216.

[10] P. Garbaczewski and J. -P. Vigier, Phys. Rev. A 46 (1992) 4634.

[11] M. Reginatto, Phys. Rev. A 58 (1998) 1775.

[12] G. Kaniadakis, Physica A 307 (2002) 172.

[13] M. J. W. Hall and M. Reginatto, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 35 (2002) 3289.

[14] F. Markopoulou and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 124029.

[15] S. L. Adler, Quantum Theory as Emergent Phenomenon, Cambridge University Press, Cam-

bridge, 2004.

[16] R. Parwani, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 38 (2005) 6231; Int. J. Theor. Phys. 45 (2006) 1921.

[17] L. Smolin, quant-ph/0609109v1 (2006).

[18] E. Santos, Phys. Lett. A 352 (2006) 49.

[19] G. Grössing, Phys. Lett. A 372 (2008) 4556.

[20] V. D. Rusov, D. S. Vlasenko and S. C. Mavrodiev, Ukr. J. Phys. 54 (2009) 1131.

[21] M. Gogberashvili, gr-gc/1008.2544v2 (2011).

[22] C. Rovelli, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 35 (1996) 1637.

[23] B. R. Frieden, Am. J. Phys. 57 (1989) 1004; Physics from Fisher Information: A Unification, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[24] A. Zeilinger, Found. Phys. 29 (1999) 631.

[25] L. Hardy, quant-ph/0101012.

[26] C. A. Fuchs, quant-ph/0205039.

[27] R. Schack, Found. Phys. 33 (2003) 1461.

[28] R. Clifton, J. Bub, and H. Halvorson, Found. Phys. 33(11) (2003) 1561.

[29] G. Brassard, Nature Physics 1 (2005) 2.

[30] G. M. D'Ariano, AIP Conf. Proc. 810, 114 (2006); 844, 101 (2006); 889, 79 (2007); Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Quantum Communication, Measurement and Computing (NICT, Japan, 2007), p. 345.

[31] J. Barrett, Phys. Rev. A 75 (2007) 032304.

[32] P. Goyal, K. H. Knuth, J. Skilling, Phys. Rev. A 81 (2009) 022109 (arXiv:0907.0909).

[33] M. Pawlowski, T. Paterek, D. Kaszlikowski, V. Scarani, A. Winter, M. Zukowski, Nature 461 (2009) 1101.

[34] C. Brukner, A. Zeilinger, Found. Phys. 39 (2009) 677.

[35] G. M. D'Ariano, in A. Bokulich and G. Jaeger, Editors, Philosophy of Quantum Information and Entanglement, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.

[36] D. Borivoje, C. Brukner, in H. Halvorson, Editor, Deep Beauty: Understanding the Quantum World through Mathematical Innovation, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011 (arXiv:0911.0695).

[37] L. Masanes, M. P. Müller, New J. Phys. 13 (2011) 063001.

[38] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A 84 (2011) 012311.

[39] M. P. Müller, L. Masanes, arXiv:1203.4516v1.

[40] G. de la Torre, L. Masanes, A. J. Short, M. P. Müller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 090403 (arXiv:1110.5482).

[41] D. I. Fivel, Found. Phys. 42 (2012) 291.

[42] L. Smolin, arXiv:1205.3707.

[43] L. Masanes, M. P. Müller, R. Augusiak, D. Pérez-García, arXiv:1208.0493v1.

[44] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[45] A. Budiyono, Physica A 392 (2013) 307.

[46] A. Budiyono, Physica A 391 (2012) 4583.

[47] A. Budiyono, Physica A 391 (2012) 3102.

[48] A. Budiyono, Physica A 391 (2012) 3081.

[49] A. Budiyono, Physica A 392 (2013) 43.

[50] A. Budiyono, Physica A (2013), in press, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2013.01.056.

[51] Y. Aharonov, H. Pendleton, A. Petersen, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 2 (1969) 213.

[52] Y. Aharonov, D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. 115 (1959) 485.

[53] W. Ehrenberg, R. E. Siday, Proc. Phys. Soc. B 62 (1949) 8.

[54] M. Peshkin, A. Tonomura, Lec. Notes. Phys. 340, Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[55] A. van Oudenaarden, M. H. Devoret, Y. V. Nazarov, J. E. Mooij, Nature 391 (1998) 768.

[56] R. Colella, A. W. Overhauser, S. A. Werner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34 (1975) 1472.

[57] H. Rund, The Hamilton-Jacobi Theory in the Calculus of Variations: Its Role in Mathematics and Physics, Van Nostrand, London, 1966.

[58] E. T. Jaynes, Probability Theory: The Logic of Science, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[59] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. 47 (1935) 777.

[60] E. Schrödinger, Naturwiss. 23 (1935) 807.

[61] J. S. Bell, Physics 1 (1964) 195; J. S. Bell, Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

[62] M. Genovese, Physics Report 413 (2005) 319 and references therein.

[63] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. 81 (2009) 865 and references therein.

[64] E. Schrödinger, Discussion of Probability Relations Between Separated Systems, Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 31 (1935) 555; 32 (1936) 446.

[65] There is a growing interest that physical constants might vary along the evolution of the universe. See for example J. P. Uzan, Rev. Mod. Phys. 75 (2003) 403 and references therein.